



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,547	11/06/2001	Harry E. Shisler	18536-06512	5438

7590 10/19/2004  
V. RANDALL GARD PARTNER  
CARR & FERRELL LLP  
2200 GENG ROAD  
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/007,547

**Applicant(s)**

SHISLER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Dung Dinh

**Art Unit**

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2152

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 07/02/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Knotts' attributes of data is not the processing properties claimed. The argument is not persuasive because applicant has misinterpreted the reference. On col.5 line 53 Knotts specifically discloses "Simplification layer 30 includes templates 32, functions 34 and properties 35". Col.6 lines 42-52 further explains that the properties specified by the user are used to customize the templates and functions to the user specific requirements. Hence, Knotts teaches processing properties as claimed.

Applicant argued that Sheffield teaches tool to define interactive application where the claims require tool to create specifications for execution of batch application. The argument is not persuasive because the batch application limitation is covered by the primary reference, Knotts. Sheffield is used as a secondary reference showing it is known in the art to provide design tool for aiding the user so that he does not need to know or need to provide data in low level details. It is obvious that a design tool for Knotts would have appropriate feature for

Art Unit: 2152

aiding the user in specifying/selecting the properties according to the user requirements.

The following rejection is a repeat of the previous office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

**Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knotts et al. US patent 6,065,002 and further in view of Sheffield et al. US patent 5,566,330.**

As per claim 1, Knotts teaches a programmable batch processing engine for a computer network comprising:

specification defining template for user-desired processing services to be performed (fig.2 #32, col.4 line 68 to col.5 line 4, lines 53-60);

Art Unit: 2152

wherein the specification identify processing properties for processing services (col.5 lines 53-64) to define the execution of a batch application (col.4 lines 43-55, "information appliance");

a specification server subsystem adapted to store said template for enable access to the template over the network (apparent from col.5 lines 15-16);

processing subsystem adapted to perform processing of the batch application (fig.2 application tool 26, col.5 lines 17-20, col.8 lines 10-40);

middleware subsystem providing communication of the specifications to the processing system (interface 24 - See col.5 line 45. to col.6 lines 17).

Knotts teaches a processing engine essentially as claimed. Knotts is silent on the design tool subsystem to create the template. However, it is inherent that Knotts must have a design tool subsystem in order to create the template. In similar field of invention, Sheffield teaches a design tool subsystem (GUI) for creating reusable and modifiable database interface object (i.e. template). (See col.1 line 55 to col. 2 line 7). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Sheffield with Knotts because it would have enable a user to create the template without extensive knowledge of

Art Unit: 2152

database operation nor code database operations in a programming language (see col.7 lines 21-25).

As per claims 2-3, it is known that an end-user and an application programmer (who design the template) could be the same person (Sheffield col.2 lines 10-12). Hence, it is inherent that the processing system and the design tool could be running on the same (i.e. a first) computer or on different computers (i.e. a second computer).

As per claim 4, Knotts teaches storing the template on a server (see fig.1 col.5 line 13-15, lines 46-47). Hence, it is apparent that the specification for creating the template are send from the designer (i.e. first computer) to the server (i.e. second computer) for storage and are send from the server to the processing system ("information appliance") for processing.

As per claim 5, Knotts teaches database middleware subsystem (col.5 lines 5-15 API 14 ODBC) for direct access to the database (col.6 lines 1-17).

As per claims 6 and 9, Knotts teaches input/output middleware system (apparent from fig 1, input#22, and output #36 and #38, col.6 lines 42-52). It is apparent that the system would have means for routing and converting input-output stream to a compatible format in order to transfer/receive data to/from the input-output devices.

Art Unit: 2152

As per claims 7-8, Knotts does not specifically disclose the processing subsystem being implemented on a second computer and to send the processing result and error to a first computer. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a second computer (i.e. a more powerful processor or server) as a processing subsystem because it would have alleviate burden on the first computer (e.g. when the first computer device has low processing power or on behave of a web-client for example).

As per claims 10-15, 16-18 and 19-21 they are rejected under similar rationales as for claims 1-9 above.

#### **Conclusion**

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2152

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Dung Dinh  
Primary Examiner  
October 15, 2004